**Motion to Refer IRTP Part C Privacy / Proxy Registrations Implementation Issues to PPSAI IRT**

1. The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council sent a letter (see <https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf>) to the ICANN Board on 1 December 2016 regarding implementation concerns with the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy ("Transfer Policy") – Part C for privacy/proxy registrations. Specifically, the concerns relate to whether the addition/removal of a privacy/proxy service potentially triggers the 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock described in the updated Transfer Policy. The policy recommendations were silent with respect to the addition/removal of privacy/proxy services, and at the time the policy was implemented, the current issue and potential harms described by the GNSO Council were not brought to ICANN org's attention.
2. In this letter, the GNSO Council requested the Board to instruct ICANN Org to work with the Registrar Stakeholder Group and other interested parties to evaluate alternatives for the implementation concerns related to Transfer Policy Part C.
3. On 16 March 2017, the Board instructed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee(s), to work with the Registrar Stakeholder Group and other interested parties to evaluate alternatives for the implementation concerns related to Transfer Policy Part C and to report back to the GNSO Council with the results of the discussion.” During this time, enforcement of the policy related to this specific issue has been deferred.
4. The Registrar Stakeholder Group discussed this issue and reached out to other interested parties to evaluate alternatives for the implementation concerns related to IRTP Part C and recommended that this issue is further evaluated by the Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Implementation Review Team (PPSAI IRT) as this group is best placed to determine if/how implementation of IRTP Part C for privacy / proxy registrations can be carried out.

Resolved,

1. The GNSO Council directs the PPSAI IRT to consider the issue of privacy/proxy registrations and IRTP Part C as outlined in the annex to the GNSO Council letter (see [https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf](https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf))) and to put forward recommendations for implementation that are consistent with the IRTP Part C policy recommendations as well as the PPSAI policy recommendations.
2. The GNSO Council requests that this work be undertaken only after the upcoming PPSAI IRT comment period, and that if it appears as though it will cause any significant or unreasonable delay in implementation of privacy/proxy service accreditation implementation, that the GNSO Council Liaison must alert the Council.
3. The GNSO Council encourages registrars and other impacted parties to join the PPSAI IRT to collaborate in these discussions.
4. The GNSO Council requests the GNSO Council Liaison to the PPSAI IRT (in consultation with ICANN org and the IRT) provides regular updates on the timeline for incorporating the issue of privacy/proxy registrations and the Transfer Policy into the work of the PPSAI implementation plan. Where issues emerge during implementation that may require possible policy discussion, the Council requests GNSO Council Liaison to the PPSAI IRT to escalate these issues using the designated procedure outlined in the Final Recommendations Report on Policy & Implementation.
5. The GNSO Council requests the GNSO Council Liaison to the PPSAI IRT to communicate this decision to the PPSAI IRT as soon as possible.